

(SRI H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.)

net profits of the Association would be set apart for any charitable purpose that Government may think of. The Association, besides, is not working with a profit motive. The exemption has been granted under certain conditions and is purely temporary.

**Paddy Seizure by the Amildar, Chintamani, from Patel Reddeppa of Gollapalli.**

Q.—668. Sri M. C. ANJANEYA REDDY (Chintamani).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether they are aware that Sri B. S. Narayan who was the Amildar of Chintamani Taluk previously entered the house of Patel Reddeppa of Gollapalli, Chilakalanerpu Hobli, Chintamani Taluk, for collecting the paddy at a time when Patel Reddappa was not in the house and took the entire quantity of paddy stocked in the house with the help of his own servants; the number of pallas of paddy so taken;

(b) (i) whether the said patel Reddeppa has alleged that a sum of rupees ten thousand kept in his granary has also been removed along with the paddy and has sought for the permission of the Government for launching a case against the Amildar in a competent court of law; (ii) whether they have granted him permission;

(c) whether they are aware that a case has been launched against the said Reddeppa by the Amildar; and how that case has been disposed of by the court;

(d) whether the pateli post of Reddeppa has been suspended; the reason for so suspending?

A.—Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA (Minister for Home and Industries).—

(a) No.

(b) (i) Yes.

(ii) No. As Government saw no reason to interfere in the matter.

(c) Yes; the case ended in discharge on 3rd November 1952.

(d) Yes, for the following reasons :—

(i) Unauthorised cultivation of Government lands.

(ii) Acting against food acquisition work of Government.

(iii) Obstruction to Government Officers on lawful duty.

(iv) Absenting himself unauthorisedly on 13th September 1950.

**Park in the Agrahar of Chintamani Town**

Q.—670. Sri M. C. ANJANEYA REDDY (Chintamani).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) whether the opening ceremony of a park in the Agrahar of Chintamani Town was performed by the Hon'ble Minister Sri T. Channiah, B.Sc., under the auspices of Chintamani Town Municipality a few days ago; the amount spent on the park and whether this amount has been met by the Municipality or paid by Sri Doddapillappa;

(b) whether this park is called "Sriman Doddapillappa's Park";

(c) whether the land in which the park is situated belongs to the Municipality, or whether it is a survey number; if it is a survey number, whether it has been properly acquired by the Municipality;

(d) whether they are aware that the Amildar has put forth a *takrar thakte* pleading that the site is not fit for a park and so cannot be alienated, due to the existence of latrines and manure pits at the southern side emitting always filthy smell?

A.—Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—

(a) Yes.

Amount spent on the Park is Rs. 2,192-12-0 and it was spent from the Municipal funds.

(b) Yes.

(c) The land does not belong to the Municipality and bears S. No. 218 Kharab of Nekkundi Village and that proposals for the alienation of this land

are under submission by the Municipality.

(d) Yes. But it refers to a separate survey number not occupied by the Municipality.

**Thimmanakunte in the Agrahara of  
Chintamani Town**

(Use of water)

Q.—674. Sri M. C. ANJANEYA  
REDDY (Chintamani).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(a) the survey number in which Thimmanakunte in the Agrahara of Chintamani Town is situated; the amount spent by the Municipality for the repairs of this kunte;

(b) whether they are aware that the Municipal President is utilising by lift irrigation the water of this kunte for irrigating his garden land?

A.—Sri T. CHANNIAH (Minister for Public Health and Local Self-Government).—

(a) The kunte is situated in S. No. 223 of Nekkundi Village within the Municipal limits.

A sum of Rs. 240-12-0 has been spent by the Municipality for effecting repairs and removal of silt.

(b) No.

**PETITION IN RESPECT OF THE  
MYSORE (RELIGIOUS AND  
CHARITABLE) INAMS ABOLI-  
TION BILL, 1954.**

SECRETARY, Mysore Legislature.—Sir, as required by Rule 95 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Legislative Assembly, I beg to report that a petition has been received by me from the Secretary of His Holiness Sri Chandrasekhara Bharathi Jagadguru Sri Sringeri Shankaracharya Gurumaharajadhiraaj Seva Samithi in respect of the Mysore (Religious and Charitable) Inams Abolition Bill, 1954.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As required by Rule 98 of the Rules of Procedure and

Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly, I refer the petition reported by the Secretary to the Committee on Petitions.

The debate on the Mysore (Personal and Miscellaneous) Inams Abolition Bill will continue now.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—The general discussion on the motion for consideration may continue, Sir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Yes.

**MYSORE (PERSONAL AND MISCEL-  
LANEOUS) INAMS ABOLITION  
BILL, 1953.**

*Motion to consider (contd).*

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T. Narsipur).—I rise to place before this Hon'ble House my observations on this Bill. At the outset, I want to know whether under Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure, the Law Minister should not also have been a member of the Select Committee. In the report of the Select Committee, I do not find the signature of the Hon'ble Minister for Law. Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Mysore Legislative Assembly says :

“that the member in charge of the Bill and the Minister for Law shall be members of every Select Committee, and it shall not be necessary to include their names in any motion for appointment of such a Committee.”

Mr. SPEAKER.—There is a different rule for Joint Select Committees.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—In the second place, with the object of the Bill, I entirely agree. The abolition of Inams is also our principle. But in respect of the way in which the problem is approached, I differ. In the first instance, the Bill as placed before this House is not for the simplification of the tenure in the Inam or Jodi or Kayamgutta villages, but is in the shape of compulsory acquisition of property. Now, Sir, as we all want that the present system of Inam villages should be abolished, I submit we should have approached the problem